

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated February 3, 2005, Applicants have amended Figs. 6-8 in the manner suggested by the Examiner so as to include the legend "Prior Art." Applicants have also amended claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter recited by claim 2. Claim 2 is canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. The dependency of claims 3 and 4 have been amended to remove the multiple claim dependency. Also, claims 6, 9 and 10 have been amended so as to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in Fig. 2 and its corresponding section of the specification. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

II. The Rejection Of Claims 1-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by USP No. 6,751,064 to Kuwajima. Claim 2 is canceled, rendering the rejection thereto moot. For the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites in-part a disk drive apparatus comprising a ramp ... *between* the bearing section and the head In accordance with one exemplary embodiment of the present invention, the ramp, which executes the load/unload (L/UL) operation, is placed at a position that does not interfere with the disk surface (e.g., between the bearing section and the head of the supporting arm). As a result, foreign particles generated by the contact between the supporting

arm and the ramp can be desirably prevented, and a highly reliable disk drive apparatus can be advantageously provided (see, e.g., page 5, lines 16-24 of the specification).

In the pending rejection, the Examiner reads the ramp 110 of Kuwajima as the claimed ramp. However, it is clear that the ramp 110 of Kuwajima is *not* placed between the bearing 105 and the slider 101 having the head mounted thereon. Rather, it appears that the ramp 110 is placed at a position outside of the area between the bearing 105 and the slider 101. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the magnetic disk drive disclosed in the prior art section of Kuwajima is different from the disk drive of the present invention.

Furthermore, Claim 1, as amended, recites in-part a load-applying means for applying a *load to the supporting arm*.

As discussed throughout the Background section of the specification, the instant inventors have discovered that the conventional head support assembly lacks the flexibility to apply a predetermined load on the slider toward the magnetic recording medium to make the slider trace the up-and-down movements of the writing surface of the magnetic recording medium. Consequently, the load and unload (L/UL) operations of the conventional disk drive become unstable due to the vibration caused when the guide is slid up the tapered ramp, and downsizing of the disk drive becomes difficult because the L/UL mechanism of the conventional disk drive is provided at the tip of the head supporting arm (see, e.g., page 4, lines 1-24 of the specification).

In view of the foregoing problems and in accordance with one exemplary embodiment of the present invention, the slider 10 is positioned by the dimple 19 via the gimbal 18 on the bottom face of one end of the supporting arm 6, where the other end of the supporting arm 6 is fixed to one end of spring portion 14, and the other end of the spring portion 14 is fixed to the

pivot bearing 17 via the spring fixing member 15. Accordingly, as the slider 10 is levitated from the magnetic recording medium 11, the compressive stress of the protrusions 17a and 17b of the pivot bearing 17 against the supporting arm 6 generates a load on the slider 10. As a result, the present invention allows a highly rigid supporting arm to rotate about the bearing section so that undesirable vibration can be prevented in the L/UL system and stable L/UL operation can be made feasible (see, e.g., page 5, lines 16-24 of the specification).

In contrast, Kuwajima discloses applying a load to the *slider* 101 in the direction of the magnetic recording medium. Kuwajima is completely silent with regard to applying a load to the *support arm* 104 (see, col. 2, lines 40-43). It is important to note that as the low-rigidity slider of Kuwajima moves vertically onto the tapered portion, vibration is inescapably produced during L/UL operations. In this regard, Kuwajima, at best, is cumulative to the admitted prior art described at pages 1-5 of Applicants' specification, and is also subject to the same drawbacks as the prior art with respect to a lack of flexibility. Thus, at a minimum, Kuwajima does not disclose or suggest a ramp ... *between* the bearing section and the head and a load-applying means for applying a *load to the supporting arm*, as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, as anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each element of the claim in issue be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983), and Kuwajima fails to disclose or suggest the foregoing claim elements, it is clear that Kuwajima does not anticipate claim 1 or any of the claims dependent thereon.

III. All Dependent Claims Are Allowable Because The Independent Claims From Which They Depend Are Allowable

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as independent claim 1 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/634,995

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/AHC
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: May 3, 2005

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please amend Figs. 6-8 as indicated on the enclosed copies thereof. Figs. 6-8 have been amended to include the legend "Prior Art."